

## **REMARKS**

### **A. Status of the Application**

- Claims 13 to 37 are pending in the application, of which claims 13, 24 and 31 are independent claims.
- Claims 1 to 12 are cancelled.
- Claims 13 to 37 are new claims. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, entry of the new claims is respectfully requested. Applicants have added the claims to recite particular embodiments that Applicants, in their business judgment, have determined to be commercially desirable at this time. The added claims have not been submitted for any reasons relating to patentability, such as to overcome any of the Office Action's rejections.

Applicants intend to pursue the subject matter of the previously cancelled claims, in one or more continuing applications.

### **B. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a)**

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,195,647 ("Martyn"). The Office Action also rejected claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Martyn in view of U.S. Appl. No. 20060069635 ("Ram").

The Examiner's rejections are moot in view of Applicants' claim amendments. Furthermore, the Office Action has not made a *prima facie* showing that any of Applicants' claims are anticipated or obvious.

C. General Comments on Dependent Claims

Since each of the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicant believes that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the allowability of each of the dependent claims individually. However, Applicant does not necessarily concur with the interpretation of the dependent claims as set forth in the Office Action, nor does Applicant concur that the basis for the rejection of any of the dependent claims is proper. Therefore, Applicant reserves the right to specifically address the patentability of the dependent claims in the future, if deemed necessary.

D. Conclusion

In general, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at (857) 413-2056.

Applicant : Philip Langridge, *et. al.*  
Serial No. : 10/759,957  
Filed : January 16, 2004  
Page : 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 04-6184

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 20, 2007

***Customer No:***

Innovation Group  
Cantor Fitzgerald, LLP  
110 E. 59<sup>th</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10002

\_\_\_\_\_/Ruth J. Ma/  
Ruth J. Ma, Reg. No. 55,414  
Attorney for Applicant  
Tel. No. (857) 413-2056  
Fax. No. (857) 413-2019